1	Denhardt, Third Selectman of Branford.
2	MR. RICK GOODWIN: Good evening. I'm the
3	Republican Town Chairman here in Branford. And my name is
4	Rick Goodwin, I live at 43 Linden Avenue.
5	You've heard a lot of testimony so far from
6	people that are pretty impressive. I want to use a
7	different factor. I want to use the cute factor. This is
8	a seal that comes right here in Branford and this was
9	taken at Outer Island about a year ago. FERC and the
10	people that work with them said that they don't need to
11	get any permits for the issue surrounding the Marine
12	Mammal Act of 1972 because they said, there's no seals
13	here. Well, guess what? They're here.
14	We had industry that is based on taking
15	tourists around and showing them these wonderful animals
16	that are here basically from the middle of September
17	through somewhere around May $1^{\rm st}$. In any case, I hope that
18	you will deny this permit. This just one of the animals
19	that will be effected by this. Obviously, there'll be a
20	heck of a lot more. Thank you for coming and do the right
21	thing.
22	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
23	speaker, Robert Demaarot, Third Selectman, Branford will

be followed by Carl Balestracci.

24

1 MR. ROBERT DENHARDT: Thank you. My name is Robert Denhardt. I live at 26 Wildwood Drive. I'm the 2. 3 First Selectman in the town of Branford. There are several things that concern me 4 5 about the Islander East proposal. A pretty basic one 6 however is safety. We're running a pipeline parallel to, 7 or close to the proximity of a railroad track. I've seen 8 nothing that shows the potential hazard of a railroad 9 track and a pipeline adjacent to each other. 10 They run the pipeline right next to, or 11 right close to the Whitewood School, again another hazard 12 or safety thing, which concerns me very much. 13 environmental issue has been covered very completely by 14 other speakers so far today. 15 The third thing that concerns me is I have 16 never seen anything that Islander East has done to show me 17 anything different. They have not done anything as far as 18 drilling through Stony Creek granite to run their pipe. The only comment I got the last time I brought this 19 question up was, well, if we can't run through the granite 20 21 then we'll go ahead and do the other measure, which is 22 dredging. Either way we're going to, you know, create a 23 lot of problems. But until they can prove to me that they 24 can run that pipeline down through Stony Creek granite and

1 then do their other drilling without any deformation to 2. beds and so forth, I am completely opposed to this project. And I appreciate you deep consideration towards 3 lack of approval. Thank you. 4 5 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next 6 speaker Donald Balestracci, First Selectman town of 7 Guilford followed by Vincent Candelora. COURT REPORTER: Can you spell your last 8 9 name? 10 MR. DONALD BALESTRACCI: Good evening. My 11 name is Donald (applause and laughter). Most people just 12 call me Mr. B. or (indiscernible) and I am your First 13 Selectman of Guilford. I'm here tonight as the First Selectmen representing Branford's neighbors, the people of 14 Guilford. This issue is not Branford's, but one which all 15 16 the people of Connecticut are vitally concerned. 17 From Greenwich to Stonington our people 18 have asked for a very simple process to be followed. We have asked our Legislature and they have almost 19 20 unanimously supported us in enacting a moratorium until 21 the following can be provided. We want a needs assessment 22 of the total amount and number of power lines, gas, 23 electric and any others that would satisfactorily serve 24 both the people of Long Island and Connecticut.

1	Two, we would like a plan developed that
2	would provide the least number of pipelines to provide the
3	necessary power that will have a minimal impact on our
4	environment and our natural resources. We understand that
5	the Army Corps has been requested to review this pipeline
6	proposal yet again, by the highest echelons of our Federal
7	government. We fully understand the awesome specter of
8	that request and the impact it has upon your Department,
9	but we ask you to join us in preserving the integrity of
10	our water, our land and our natural resources.
11	We ask you to do this not just for us, but
12	for the next generation and those that will follow. Not
13	for the next election, but for the future of us all.
14	Thank you.
15	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
16	speaker is Vincent Candelora.
17	MR. VINCENT CANDELORA: Vincent Candelora,
18	Town Council, town of North Branford. On behalf of the
19	town of North Branford I wish to congratulate the Corps in
20	exercising leadership by standing (indiscernible) of their
21	review in assessing the wider environmental impact of this
22	project.
23	We asked for this hearing to evaluate the
24	impacts to water qualities, water supply, environmental

wetlands and the welfare of the people of North Branford. 1 2. While inland from the Long Island Sound, 3 part of Islander East North Branford crosses in areas of significant secondary impacts. The pipeline is proposed 4 5 to cross and disturb an area of pre-existing groundwater 6 contamination with the presence of PCE. Connecticut's 7 Department of Health has determined that exposure to 8 groundwater contaminated with PCE can cause liver or 9 kidney damage. 10 The Connecticut Department of Environmental 11 Protection was so concerned by this contamination that a 12 few years ago they had Ridgeville Associates as a 13 consultant to assess the site. Ridgeville Associates 14 advised against further disturbance or testing of the 15 contaminated site to prevent the spread of a pollution 16 foam and documenting the PCE's that was in question. By 17 disturbing the pollution foam Islander East wants to risk 18 its impacting local potable water supplies and reaching Long Island Sound from North Branford through a series of 19 20 (indiscernible). 21 Even amongst the presence of the underground pollution foam outlined by Islander East can 22 23 upset the delicate balance of water flow to private wells 2.4 that many of our residents enjoy. Further, if the

1 proposed project crosses this designated watershed for the 2. South Central Regional Water Authority. The project will 3 also prove detrimental to Cedar Pond and downstream Lindsey Pond, which possess unique environmental 4 characteristics as it's identified by the State of 5 6 Connecticut's National Diversity Database. 7 In summary, as proposed this entire project 8 suffers from poor planning and we are afraid it will also 9 result in poor public policy that proves no benefit to our community or the State of Connecticut. It is clear that 10 11 this project destroys the natural resources of this area, 12 is not environmentally sound and runs counter to the 13 environmental preservation and conservation policies of 14 the town and the State of Connecticut. 15 Expressed more simply, we view this project 16 as a project developed -- excuse me, we view this project 17 as a development by mandate and not by design. 18 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next speaker, John Lust, Branford Town Planning and Zoning 19 Office. He'll be followed by John Opie, Branford RTM, 20 21 Second District. 22 MR. JOHN LUST: Good evening. May name is 23 John Lust. I'm Planning and Zoning Commissioner and I'm 24 current Chair of Branford's Blue Ribbon Committee to study

- this pipeline. The town enjoys an open channel of communication with your Agency and we appreciate that.

 I'll be brief.
- Two items I'd like to address tonight. 4 5 first is allowing Applicants to use best case modeling in 6 their applications. I'd like to think that we've learned 7 that this doesn't work looking at Iroquois and now looking at the HUB Line Project. The HUB Line Project I believe 8 was supposed to be done in May and it's still ongoing. I 9 10 don't have to tell you the problems that they've incurred. 11 Islander East is using the winter of 2001-2002 as a That's obviously atypical and can't be relied on 12 13 to duplicate itself when this pipeline is proposed to go 14 through.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Secondly, I'd like to address Islander's most recent modification to their application. The shallow burying technique with riprap overlay just is not a good idea. It puts the pipeline much too close to the surface. The riprap covering totally destroys acres of productive ethnic (phonetic) area. And it -- because of that it'll interrupt any commercial shellfishing activity in the area. This particular area happens to be recently approved as Branford's commercial shellfishing area and so it's going to displace the water-dependent use. It's

1	going to permanently destroy that area of the Sound and
2	it's going to present navigational hazards as
3	shellfishermen try and manipulate their way around area
4	with their raking and dredging rigs.
5	Thank you very much.
6	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
7	speaker, John Opie, followed by Chris Sullivan, Branford
8	Conservation Environmental Commission.
9	MR. JOHN OPIE: Good evening. My name is
10	John Opie and I live at number 15 Buena Vista Road in
11	Stony Creek, among some of that aforementioned Stony Creek
12	granite.
13	I'd like to voice my opposition to the
14	Islander East Pipeline proposal as a Branford resident and
15	as an RTM representative from the Second District through
16	which the project would run. I'm neither an environmental
17	expert nor civil engineer, but my objections are based
18	solely on common sense and logic. I submit to you that
19	the Islander East project as proposed is entirely based on
20	corporate greed and not civic need.
21	I fully comprehend and appreciate the
22	concept and need for sharing of our energy resources
23	through a distribution grid system. I'm sure that the
24	town of Branford and the State of Connecticut will always

1	be willing participants when the need justifies the
2	sacrifice. In the case of Islander East the civic need
3	has not been proven to balance the environmental havoc it
4	will cause.
5	This past winter was about as severe as
6	winters get in New England. If there were real need for
7	more of natural gas on Long Island the evening news would
8	have carried stories of residents facing energy-related
9	hardships rather than commercial advertisements extolling
10	the virtues of modern gas heat and encouraging oil
11	customers to convert.
12	If improvements are in fact needed to the
13	distribution system a far more sensible solution would be
14	the mid-Sound linkage to the Iroquois system. While the
15	corporate profits of Duke Energy and Keyspan may be
16	somewhat less than hoped by their management, the mission
17	will be accomplished and the majority of environmental
18	destruction will be avoided. Thank you.
19	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
20	speaker, Chris Sullivan who will be followed by Christine
21	W-A-N-E-R-K-A or $W-A-N-E-R-L-L-A$, I'm not sure.
22	MR. CHRIS SULLIVAN: Hi. My name is Chris
23	Sullivan. I'm a member of Branford's Conservation and
24	Environment Commission and I'm opposed to the pipeline

1 project. 2. The Islander East pipeline proposal is 3 inherently flawed and I'm strongly opposed to the continuation of the project and request you, the Army 4 5 Corps, to deny the permits requires for sections of the 6 Rivers and Harbors Act and the Clean Water Act. 7 largest concern I have of this proposal is the strong 8 likelihood of negative impacts on the local Harbor and 9 Gray Seal populations. These animals inhabit the area and 10 on and around the Thimble Islands at various times 11 throughout the year with individuals remaining all year 12 long. A recent March 2003 survey documented 44 seals off 13 of Outer Island. 14 Both Harbor and Gray Seals are protected 15 under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. 16 established a moratorium on taking and importation of 17 marine mammals. Within the Act taking is defined as, to 18 harass, hunt, capture, kill or attempt to harass, hunt, capture or kill. This Act also defines two types of 19 20 harassment. Type B is the most important in terms of 21 relevance toward the Islander East proposal. This type of

harassment is defined as having potential to disturb a

marine mammal in the wild by causing disruption of

behavioral patterns, including but not limited to

22

23

24

1 migration, breeding, feeding and sheltering. The key to 2. this passage is having the potential to disturb. 3 Since seals are relatively shy creatures and are easily disturbed I believe that the noise from the 4 5 drilling and other pipeline related activities will result 6 in many seals leaving the area. Not only will this be a 7 problem ecologically, but economically as well. There is a 8 company in Branford that runs tours specifically to see the seals. If there are no seals, there are no tours 9 10 resulting in less tourist money into our local economy. 11 In a recent letter from the DEP the Thimble Islanders were recognized as one of our four primary seal 12 13 haul out sights in Connecticut. This fact is sited from 14 the Norwalk Aquarium and I will submitting some photos of these seals with my written comments. 15 16 With the Thimbles being recognized as a 17 primary haul out site it seems to refute the findings in the FEIS from National Marine Fishery Service that the 18 majority of the seals in Long Island Sound are found in 19 other areas near concentrations of anadromous fishes. 20 21 With several large freshwater streams and rivers in the 22 local area I would also expect to find several of these

during the year. In fact, a recent fish ladder viability

fish species in waters off Branford at various times

23

24

58

HEARING RE: ALGONQUIN GAS/ISLANDER EAST AUGUST 5, 2003

1 survey discovered evidence of alewife and herring at the 2. base of the Supply Pond Dam here in Branford. Both of these types of fish are anadromous and potential food 3 sources for the seals. 4 5 And I see my red light is up, so I'll just 6 submit the rest in writing. 7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Next 8 speaker, could you please pronounce and spell your last 9 name please? 10 MS. CHRISTINE WANERKA: Sure. 11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Who will be followed 12 by Jonathan Walters. 13 MS. WANERKA: It's Christine Wanerka, and I'm speaking for the League of Women Voters of East Shore. 14 15 I'm Chairman of the Branford Unit. 16 I wish only to reiterate the position that 17 we have taken for the past almost nine months now and that 18 is as follows. Since the proposed Islander East Pipeline would contradict the majority of our positions we must 19 oppose it. I have submitted a summary of these positions 20 21 as it has been printed in the local papers to the 22 recorder.

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

Thank you ma'am.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG:

Next speaker, Anthony DaRos who will be followed by

23

2.4

1	Jonathan Walters.
2	MR. ANTHONY DaROS: Good evening and
3	welcome to Branford. I'm the First Selectman of the town
4	of Branford, Anthony DaRos. I live at 27 Watrous Avenue.
5	As you know, this is one of many public
6	meetings we've had. The first was two years ago last week
7	when I called a special meeting of the Board of Selectmen
8	to provide the public with its first real chance to obtain
9	information from Duke Energy's representatives. That was
10	necessary because the public information session that Duke
11	held several weeks earlier was an insult. They provided
12	no substantive information and misrepresented themselves.
13	More than two years later nothing's
14	changed. You were copied too on the DEP Commissioner
15	Rocque's letter last week denying the CZMP consistency
16	certification. Not only did that letter deny
17	certification, but it reached the same conclusion that the
18	town's Blue Ribbon Committee reached in October 2001. That
19	the application is incomplete and insufficient. Nothing
	one application is incomplete and insallication. Incoming
20	has changed, regardless of how many times it's been
20 21	
	has changed, regardless of how many times it's been
21	has changed, regardless of how many times it's been modified.

1 questions such as the amount of the bond they would post, 2. what they plan to do if the underwater drilling didn't work, or even what kind of certificate they were asking of 3 FERC in the application. 4 5 The same theme prevailed throughout the 6 hearings by the town's Blue Ribbon Committee. If you 7 haven't read that report I will be submitting this copy 8 for your record. After five nights of testimony and 9 hundreds of hours of review and study the Committee 10 reported that Duke's plans were unable to meet even our 11 local building, zoning and environmental compliance 12 standards, mainly because there wasn't enough information 13 in the application. We weren't looking for quantity, but 14 quality, and found none. If you would like the 15 transcripts from those hearings I would gladly provide 16 them for you. 17 Branford does not have the financial 18 resources that Duke and Keyspan have. We can't hire lobbyists and others to mount a campaign against them. 19 20 They have spent more than \$25,000,000 so far. We've spent 21 tens of thousands of hours of volunteers' time and energy 22 studying these issues. But we're realistic and know that 23 we can't match Duke's money and influence and that the 24 playing field is not level.

1	So the issue becomes, and this is the
2	issue, who acts for the public trust? Certainly not Duke
3	Energy or Keyspan. Their sole objective is to make as
4	much money as possible no matter what the environmental or
5	economic cost. That's why they even refuse to consider
6	any alternative routes, even though they'd be less
7	environmentally damaging.
8	In each of the previous public hearings
9	dozens of citizens made public statements. You can expect
10	that again tonight. Throughout all these hearings I
11	cannot recall a single voice that supported this plan.
12	Tonight may be different.
13	Duke and Keyspan have worked hard to
13 14	Duke and Keyspan have worked hard to ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid
14	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid
14 15	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers
14 15 16	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers for their ink and even conducted a sham telephone survey
14 15 16 17	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers for their ink and even conducted a sham telephone survey last month. So don't be surprised if you hear someone say
14 15 16 17 18	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers for their ink and even conducted a sham telephone survey last month. So don't be surprised if you hear someone say that they think the pipeline folks have all the right
14 15 16 17 18 19	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers for their ink and even conducted a sham telephone survey last month. So don't be surprised if you hear someone say that they think the pipeline folks have all the right answers. Just know that it's the first time such
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers for their ink and even conducted a sham telephone survey last month. So don't be surprised if you hear someone say that they think the pipeline folks have all the right answers. Just know that it's the first time such statements are being made and are not based on any
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ingrate themselves with the business community. Have paid tens of thousands of dollars to a variety of newspapers for their ink and even conducted a sham telephone survey last month. So don't be surprised if you hear someone say that they think the pipeline folks have all the right answers. Just know that it's the first time such statements are being made and are not based on any objective analysis of the plan.

1 Smith. Once again, if you have lengthy written statements 2. please summarize it to a two-minute limitation. 3 additional stenographer is available in the registration area with no time restrictions. 4 5 MR. JONATHAN WATERS: I'm Jonathan Waters. 6 I represent RTM Second District, Stony Creek. I'm also 7 an oyster farmer from Stony Creek. I wish to read to you an excerpt from a paper published August 1st, 2003 an 8 article in the Meriden Connecticut Record Journal. It's 9 attributed to Mr. John Sheriden of Duke Energy and 10 11 Islander East. Sheriden asserts that the construction of 12 13 the pipeline will not have long-term impact on shellfish. 14 The pipeline will be installed 100 feet below the seabed, a process that will minimize impact to shellfish beds and 15 16 other environmentally sensitive areas. Any impact will be 17 short term he said. Other activities including the methods fishermen use to dredge clam beds cause more 18 destruction for longer periods of time. 19 20 Sheriden also took exception to the DEP's 21 assertion that the plan would harm oysterism in the Sound. 22 There are no oysters in the Sound, Sheriden said. 23 Islander East has scanned the seabed with a robot and it's 24 found no oysters.

1	Well, this afternoon I harvested this
2	beauty, along with a few of his or her brothers and
3	sisters from Lot 168. That's within the pipeline corridor
4	and it's within 100 feet of the proposed pipeline. I'd
5	also like to point out that shellfishing activity is a
6	historically water dependent use. Islander East Pipeline
7	is not. Thank you.
8	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
9	speaker is John Smith who will be followed by Dr. Lance
10	Stewart.
11	MR. JOHN SMITH: Thank you. I want to
12	welcome the Corps here to our small town of Branford. My
13	name is John Smith and I live at 104 Shore Drive in Short
14	Beach, which is a complete opposite side of where this
15	pipeline is going to be going into. I'm the majority
16	leader of the RTM, which is the Representative Town
17	Meeting, which is our form of government, selected to the
18	RTM. There's 30 members that are elected from the
19	district. And we're unanimously opposed to this pipeline.
20	Over the last two years we have seen no
21	economic, social, or political, or environmental benefit
22	from this proposed pipeline and the gas transmission. You
23	will not help economically but on short-term through job
24	creation for pipe fitters and that type of thing. It has

1 no long-term job creation, which is needed across the 2. whole country, but in our town right now. It environmentally impacts on lands that 3 the RTM and the Branford Land Trust have worked over the 4 5 course of 40 years to preserve as a natural habitat for 6 people for walking and passive type of recreation. Ιt 7 will impact also because it's going to run along a railroad track that has houses that abut it and schools 8 that abut it, which present a 24-inch pipe full of gas a 9 potential for tremendous hazard. 10 11 But more importantly, or almost importantly 12 it ends up going into Stony Creek and the Thimble Islands. 13 And that is really -- the water is what the majority of 14 the people of Branford are here for. It's part of the socioeconomic climate, the ambiance of the town, and that 15 16 will impact. Jonathan Waters is one of our guys that 17 stills works down there and makes money claming off of 18 that. And you've heard from our friends in 19 Stratford who have been here and have seen the results for 20 21 10 years and it's been a negative effect, extremely 22 negative effect. So I want to welcome you to our town. Ι 23 want to welcome you to our renovated high school, which 24 comes from our hard-earned tax dollars. And as members of

1	the government and representatives of the Corps, I hope
2	that you would listen to the small people, the people in
3	this town and the impact this proposed pipeline would have
4	and do the right thing. Do the thing that says this is
5	not an appropriate time. It doesn't justify it
6	economically from the needs of gas on Long Island Sound
7	and most certainly has a tremendous potential of impacting
8	our environment and the way of life that we have here.
9	And I thank you for your time.
10	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
11	speaker, Dr. Lance Stewart followed by Richard Shanahan.
12	DR. LANCE STEWART: Yes. I'd like to thank
13	the Corps of Engineers for entertaining comments. And I
14	will reiterate a view that I've made at hearings in the
15	past before FERC and also the public hearings here, that
16	I'll give you my perspective.
17	I'm a marine biologist with the University
18	of Connecticut. For 35 years I've spent countless hours
19	on the water diving in habitats, doing research on
20	lobster, (indiscernible) Management Program for 15 years.
21	Part of the perspectives I see is a lack of attention by
22	the Applicant to really address marine biological issues.
23	Species that have been sited are erroneous or the
24	predominant ones have been ignored.

1 Other issues are the extreme importance of 2. habitat. I've served with Senator Gunther on the United 3 States Marine Fisheries Commission for the last eight I co-chair the Habitat Committee for that state 4 5 representative body from Maine to Florida. Essential fish 6 habitat is part of the Magnuson Act Mandate, not 7 considered here at all. Habitat locations for lobsters that are known to be clustered in environments through the 8 9 25-mile route haven't even been pre-reconnaissanced at 10 all. 11 The other important issue that we bring up 12 scientifically several times over the last two years is 13 that very little is known about trench ecology. That pit 14 in the ocean floor that entrains animals, larvae. All the animal cycles that renew the bountiful species that we 15 16 have as adults have to start with larval benthic 17 environments and the entrainment, entrapment, the anoxic conditions that could occur in trench environments have 18 not been investigated. Even in many of the pre-approved 19 projects that have already occurred, like the HUB Line. 20 21 Essential research has to be done in this arena. 22 And I would just offer a word suggestion 23 that you take the vigilance that you did with the dredge 24 material projects that were of National defense and apply

1	the same measure or standard of oversight to this project,
2	or any of the future ones. We know there are about 10
3	proposed, not just this one. So we have a lot of work to
4	do to understand the issues that they will have on our
5	environment. Thank you.
6	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
7	speaker, Richard Shanahan followed by Cinda Cash from
8	Stony Creek.
9	MR. RICHARD SHANAHAN: My name is Richard
10	Shanahan. I'm here to tonight to speak as Vice President
11	for the Branford Land Trust. I'm also speaking on behalf
12	of Joan Marek, who is President of the Land Trust who
13	could not make it here tonight.
14	The Branford Land Trust is a totally
15	volunteer non-profit organization supported by the
16	citizens and businesses of Branford. Land is entrusted to
17	the Land Trust with the expectations that it will be
18	protected as open space for the benefit of future
19	generations.
20	With a population density of over 1,300
21	people per square mile the true value of our properties
22	are impossible to calculate. They protect the air and
23	water quality of our community as well as Long Island
24	Sound. They provide habitat for wildlife and fauna. They

provide for recreation. They provide buffers between 1 2. commercial, industrial, and residential areas. As the few remaining parcels of private land are being developed, the 3 value of these protected properties increase. 4 5 Unfortunately, Islander East is looking at 6 these protected properties only in a purely economic sense 7 as, quote, unquote, unimproved land and ignores many of the intangible values. As a result, it is very ironic 8 9 that the very properties that the residents of Branford 10 have worked so hard to acquire and protect over the years, 11 have now become prime targets for utility right of ways 12 and eminent domain proceedings because they are the 13 cheapest to acquire and develop and thus maximize the 14 profits for these companies. 15 The only reason we're here tonight is 16 because Islander East is attempting to maximize profits 17 for their parent company and shareholders. They do not care for the residents or businesses of Long Island 18 anymore than they care for the residents of Branford. 19 Ι can say this with conviction because there are indeed 20 21 other environmentally less damaging alternatives to this 22 proposal. 23 Our properties have been placed in trust. 24 Development of these properties in any manner, but

69

1	especially for private economic gain, is a violation of
2	that trust. Speaking on behalf of the Branford Land
3	Trust, we are adamantly opposed to this project.
4	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
5	speaker, Cinda is that correct? Cash?
6	MS. CINDA CASH: Yes.
7	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: To be followed by
8	Stephen Dudley. Ma'am?
9	MS. CASH: Hi. My name is Cinda Cash and I
10	live at 33 Buena Vista Road in Stony Creek and I'm a
11	Second District Representative to the RTM.
12	The proposed pipeline hits the families in
13	the Second District very hard and that's why I'm here
14	today to speak out against this proposal. The proposed
15	pipeline benefits no one in Branford. Furthermore, it is
16	potentially dangerous to our citizens and our children.
17	This is not one of those, not in my backyard issues, this
18	is an environment and public safety issue. And I submit
19	to you it's also a political issue.
20	Connecticut's DEP denied Islander East
21	approval to move forward with their plan. Then Islander
22	East came back again after dealing with the Federal
23	government and they were denied again by Connecticut's
24	DEP. The file was closed. But they're back again. They

1	simply will not take no for an answer. Why? Because they
2	feel they have the backing of a Federal administration
3	that is pro big business and anti community. They need
4	this project to help grow their company for profit.
5	Islander East and it's parent companies are
6	part of a very large U.S. corporate energy lobbying
7	industry at the Federal level. There is no doubt that
8	this attack on our adored Branford and Long Island Sound
9	will continue for some time. We will be bold, strategic
10	and continue to be focused on ending this terrible attack
11	on our community.
12	As RTM members we will help lead the fight
13	against this big business taking over our community. We
14	must stand firm and as a community we will. Thank you.
15	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you ma'am. The
16	next speaker, Stephen Dudley followed by Kyle Nelson.
17	MR. STEPHEN DUDLEY: Good evening. My name
18	is Stephen Dudley. I'm the Town Engineer for the town of
19	Branford and have served in capacity for 17 years. I'm
20	also a licensed professional engineer and land surveyor in
21	the State of Connecticut.
22	Two years ago the town of Branford held
23	public hearings and meetings concerning the Islander East
24	Pipeline proposal. At those public hearings I raised

1 several issues concerning the lack of information on 2. specifics of construction, pipeline route, impacts on town 3 facilities and utilities, as well as environmental safequards. To date my office has not been contacted by 4 5 Islander East to provide any additional information to 6 address these concerns. We remain concerned that these 7 important issues will not be addressed. The Applicant's lack of action and 8 9 unwillingness to provide the information to the town is 10 even more troubling now than it was two years ago. After 11 over 30 years in the civil engineering profession it is 12 beyond my comprehension how a project of this magnitude 13 can proceed to this point on minimal and at best schematic 14 plans. Standard engineering procedure is to prepare far more detailed plans and investigations than have been 15 16 disclosed by Islander East. These should before all 17 levels of government for review and comment. 18 statements by Islander East that they will address any questions in the future are unacceptable. The answers 19 20 should be here now. 21 In closing, I ask the same question that I 22 posed two years ago and which remains unanswered. mechanism exists, or can exist that will assure that the 23 24 issues raised now and in the future are addressed to the

1	town's satisfaction as the design is refined and
2	construction undertaken? The protection of Branford's
3	infrastructure and environmental resources rests upon the
4	process utilized to answer that question.
5	And beyond my professional capacity, as an
6	individual I'm completely opposed to this project. Thank
7	you.
8	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
9	speaker, Kyle Nelson followed by Anne Fortunato.
10	MR. KYLE NELSON: Good evening. My name is
11	Kyle Nelson. I'm a lifelong resident of Branford, the $4^{\rm th}$
12	District RTM Representative here in town, Vice Chairman of
13	the Branford Republican Town Committee, member of the Blue
14	Ribbon Commission and past Chairman of the Branford
15	Shellfish Commission.
16	I'm here tonight to raise my opposition to
17	this pipeline project on behalf of all of the above. The
18	negative impacts of this pipeline on wildlife, fish,
19	shellfish in Branford leads to one simple conclusion. Not
20	in Branford. The Island East Project will damage and
21	destroy limited valuable shellfish resources. The damage
22	to these grounds has been supported in the July 29^{th}
23	decision by our own Connecticut Department of
24	Environmental Protection, the details of which obviously

1 you'll be receiving a copy of, but I want to highlight a 2. couple of things. 3 Specifically in their findings and in the Blue Ribbon Commission's findings, the impact to shellfish 4 5 beds along the grounds in Branford total about five acres 6 being permanently altered or rendered unsuitable for 7 commercial shellfishing because of the cobble would 8 interfere in harvest technologies. And one of our shellfishmen already referred to that cobble as really not 9 10 being amenable to replantation. 11 Yet Islander East says, we're going to make 12 it better. The fact is, Islander East has not provided a 13 viable means to rectify the damage their pipeline will do 14 to our shellfish beds. These are a valuable resource in the town of Branford. The town is leasing these 15 16 properties to commercial entities to offset revenues that 17 aren't coming back from the Federal government and the State. And these revenues are in jeopardy, which means 18 that our taxes as well as our cost of living will also be 19 impacted by this project, let alone the environmental 20 21 impacts that occur. As residents of Connecticut we do have an 22 23 obligation to participate in the regional grid of 24 development of energy, but at the same time we shouldn't

have to do it at a valuable environmental resource
jeopardy. I encourage you to look at this application,
review it thoroughly and come to one conclusion that not
in Branford is the only answer. Thank you very much.
MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
speaker Anne Fortunato followed by Becky Mars.
MS. ANNE FORTUNATO: I'm Anne Fortunato,
108 Cedar Knolls Drive and I've been asked to read this
email that was sent to the Stop the Pipeline web site.
"I was surprised to learn that a pipeline
across Long Island Sound was depending on gas all the way
from where I live in Nova Scotia, Canada. As someone
interested in renewable energy and the environment I
followed the natural gas exploration around Sable Island
in Nova Scotia. I'm surprised because all we here where I
live is there isn't enough Sable Gas to meet our own needs
and continue what we already export in a pipeline to Maine
and New Hampshire.
Why? Because Shell Canada downgraded it's
Sable Gas reserves. Shell says, new finds around the
Sable Offshore Energy project will be needed to keep the
present production level of about 530,000,000 cubic feet a
day flowing to existing customers on the Maritimes and
Northeast Pipeline.

1 Shell is partners with the Sable Offshore 2. Energy Project, which includes Mobil and Exxon. 3 says gas production levels from the Sable Project are down 11.5 percent in the first half of 2003. The Sable 4 5 reserves are more uncertain than originally thought. 6 will take more work and more money to keep production up 7 at the 500,000,000 cubic feet per day range over the next five to six years. Even if additional Scotian Shelf 8 discoveries are made in the Sable area, they will only 9 10 help to stretch the existing production levels beyond five 11 to six years. 12 Canada's National Energy Board even held a 13 hearing this spring into this serious lack of gas in New 14 Brunswick after the government there became concerned. 15 Shell twice has reduced its estimate of the total Sable 16 reserves bringing the number down from 3.6 trillion cubic 17 feet to 2.3 trillion cubic feet. A new gas line called Deep Panuke is now stalled while the oil companies look 18 for more gas. Even if it was developed it would only 19 provide 750 billion cubic feet of gas." 20 21 I'm going to skip down to, "If I read your 22 newspaper right, the people of Long Island and Connecticut 23 were better informed, they would be asking the Army Corps 24 of Engineers and your FERC some important questions like,

1 Why are Duke Pipeline and Keyspan Electricity seeking 2. approval to build a Long Island Sound pipeline, and a Long 3 Island generation plant depending on a new Nova Scotia Gas supply that is not even discovered and proven up yet? And 4 5 what's more, do they know even if a large new gas 6 discovery is made, it would be used to ensure the existing 7 flow rates from the existing Sable Project to existing 8 customers? I would think the National Energy Board of 9 Canada, which is the same as your Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, would insist that the existing 10 11 customers of Sable Gas who get deliveries from the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline are served first by any 12 13 new gas discovery. 14 And even if a total of another two trillion 15 cubic feet is discovered off Nova Scotia it would take at 16 least five years to get it to Connecticut. That's how 17 long it takes from discovery to get the government approval and to construct offshore production facilities 18 and new enlarged offshore and onshore pipelines to carry 19 it all the way from Canada to Connecticut. Is that 2008 20 21 or 2009 from today? 22 So unfortunately, while we in Canada would 23 like to help our good U.S. neighbors, it's a mystery to me 2.4 how we can do it with Sable Gas for quite sometime.

1	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you ma'am.
2	Thank you very much. Next speaker, Becky Mars who will be
3	followed by Sherry Peterson. We've just received the sign
4	from the stenographer we need to take a break. If Ms.
5	Peterson thank you. Ma'am?
6	MS. BECKY MARS: Hello. I'm Becky Mars.
7	For two years now I have been an intervenor in the
8	Islander East Pipeline and FERC at the Connecticut Siting
9	levels. I have read every word of the Islander East
10	application and correspondence between intervenors and
11	interested parties. I have watched the regulatory process
12	for certifying cables and pipelines in the Northeast and
13	have seen various stages both implementation and
14	abandonment of the Cross Sound, HUB Line, Cross Bay and
15	Millenniums.
16	I am certainly not an expert, but I see
17	three overwhelmingly recurrent themes. Government
18	regulatory agencies do not have the staff and resources to
19	adequately deal with these enormous projects in a
20	proactive way to avoid environmental impacts to our land
21	and water.
22	Two, while energy companies purport to be
23	environmentally sensitive it is counterintuitive to expect
24	them to make less impacting decisions. In fact, most

1 pipeline and cable applications are very broad and allow 2. third party independent contractors to make major 3 decisions about installation in the field. Three, energy projects are often rubber 4 5 stamped for approval prior to scientific data collection, 6 data that would show how these very methodologies could 7 fail or be more impacting than stated in their 8 applications. 9 Duke Energy's HUB Line has a failed HDD, as 10 you know, which has delayed this project for months. They 11 have left trenches open this summer and while incurring 12 fines from Massachusetts the damage is being done with no 13 recourse or solutions. Clearly HDD data was not adequately assessed prior and open trenches during the 14 summer were not included in the FEIS. 15 16 The Cross Sound Cable debacle rendered a 17 cable useless even after damaging installation had been 18 Fracouts occurred and bentonite spills amassed in our New Haven harbor. How much environmental damage do we 19 20 need to incur to teach us that proactive scientific data 21 and correct siting of these utility infrastructures are 22 essential? 23 The Islander East project is headed in the 2.4 same direction. For example, FERC very specifically

1	requested offshore borings to determine soil compatibility
2	and success for the HDD. IE said they would submit data
3	at a later date, but never did complete the testing. FERC
4	gave IE their certification without even re-requesting
5	this crucial information.
6	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Time is up.
7	MS. MARS: Oh, I'm sorry.
8	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Would you please
9	submit the entire statement for record?
10	MS. MARS: Okay.
11	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker is
12	Sherry Peterson following that we will go to a break.
13	MS. SHERRY PETERSON: Good evening. My
14	name is Sherry Peterson, 282 Pine Orchard Road, Branford,
15	Connecticut. I'm speaking as a representative for the
16	Pine Orchard Association, a letter that was submitted by
17	Jennifer Aniskovich, the President of that association,
18	and if time allows, my own comments.
19	"On behalf of the Pine Orchard Association
20	I urge you to reject the proposal by Islander East to
21	construct a pipeline through Branford. As proposed, the
22	pipeline will cut through three protected Land Trust
23	properties, disrupt protected wetlands, deplete available
24	open space and drastically change the nature of a number

1 of residential communities. 2. Pine Orchard, a 100-year-old shoreline community, would be particularly devastated by the 3 pipeline. Through our local association, the residents of 4 5 Pine Orchard have worked hard over the past century to 6 preserve the beauty, safety and ecological balance of our 7 community. We are sensitive to preserving Long Island 8 Sound, protecting wetlands and making sure that Pine Orchard is a healthy, safe and inviting community for 9 10 future generations. 11 As proposed, the pipeline would negatively 12 impact many unique and vulnerable areas in Pine Orchard. 13 It would cross beneath Route 146, a state-designated 14 scenic highway. It would cut through the residential neighborhoods of Pleasant Point and Juniper Point, 15 16 creating a permanent hazard for generations of children 17 who will be raised here. It would continue into the Sound at one of our most ecologically sensitive points, just off 18 the coast of Pine Orchard, where shellfish are numerous 19 20 and the ecological balance is at risk. The pipeline would 21 cut through the land that is protected by the local Land 22 Trust and wreak havoc on the wetlands. We believe that the impact on Pine Orchard 23 2.4 would be greatly disproportionate to any value the

1 pipeline might bring. We also believe that there are 2. other viable options for locating the pipeline in such a way that human and ecological damage could be minimized. 3 Accordingly, the Pine Orchard Association executive 4 5 Committee, the governing board of the Association, has 6 adopted the following resolution in opposition to the 7 Islander East Pipeline. The Pine Orchard Association is strongly 8 9 opposed to the Islander East Pipeline proposal to build a 10 new 24-inch diameter pipeline from an existing gas 11 transmission facility in North Haven through portions of 12 Branford. We believe the pipeline would impact protected 13 wetlands, take over open space, threaten the ecological 14 balance in our shoreline community, disrupt residential neighborhoods and devalue the land in Pine Orchard. 15 16 hereby urge the United States Army Corps of Engineers to 17 reject this proposal. Sincerely, Jennifer Aniskovich, President, 18 Pine Orchard Association." 19 20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you ma'am. 21 Ladies and gentlemen, we will take a break now. As a 22 reminder, once again the stenographer will be available to 23 take your comments during the break without time limits. 2.4 Members of the media need to check in with Tim Dugan

1 (phonetic). If you wish to find out where you are in the 2. cue, please give your names to Sally Rigione at the registration table and she will have that information for 3 you prior to reconvening at approximately 10 after 9:00. 4 5 (Off the record) 6 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The first speaker, 7 Jim Rutushni, will be followed by Frank Kinney. 8 MR. JIM RUTUSHNI: Good evening. My name 9 is Jim Rutushni. I represent the Shellfish Commission of Branford, Connecticut. And I live on 39 Lanphier Road in 10 11 Branford, Connecticut. 12 "I am writing you to represent the views of 13 the Branford Shellfish Commission regarding the Islander 14 Pipeline East. We the Shellfish Commission, would like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to deny Islander East 15 16 their permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. 17 Furthermore, we entirely agree with DEP's decision on July 29th on the Federal coastal consistency --18 on the Coastal Zoning Management Act. We the Shellfish 19 Commission believe that the Islander Pipeline East would 20 21 significantly and adversely harm both designated and 22 undesignated shellfish beds in the Branford shellfish 23 grounds.

Designated beds would be harmed by the

24

1 effects of the sediment from the construction. 2. Undesignated beds, through which the pipeline is proposed to pass directly through would irrevocably degrade and 3 destroy these beds. 4 Clearly the shellfish grounds offer 5 6 valuable economic use for local fishermen with potential revenues for the Town of Branford. Shellfishing in the 7 8 water -- the shellfishing is a water-dependent use from this area and we'd like to keep it that way. The DEP 9 Commissioner, Arthur Rocque, and his denial based on a 10 11 consistency to Islander East, the Islander East Pipeline 12 is a non-water-dependent use of this area and should never 13 be permitted to supersede the shellfishing in the area. 14 So we the Shellfish Commission request that the permit for the Islander East be denied. And thank you 15 16 for your time." 17 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. 18 speaker, Frank Kinney will be followed by Gina R-I-V-E-Z-19 Z-I. 20 MR. FRANK KINNEY: My name is Frank Kinney. 21 I'm a resident of Branford. I live at 42 Bradley Avenue. 22 I'm here tonight to state my opposition to the Islander East Pipeline, which will run through 23

Branford. I agree with the denial by Connecticut DEP

24

1 Commissioner, Arthur Rocque that Islander East Pipeline 2. would cause significant adverse impact to coastal 3 resources and water-dependent uses. He also stated that the project's route would go through environmentally 4 5 sensitive areas. 6 I want to thank the Connecticut DEP for 7 maintaining a pro-environment and pro-community position on this issue. I would suggest that the Army Corps of 8 9 Engineers suggest to Islander East that they look closely at the Connecticut DEP denial and find an alternate route 10 11 that would be environmentally sound. 12 We heard a lot of comments here tonight, 13 all of which I agree with, and I think we're probably 14 going to hear a lot more along the same lines. 15 without being too redundant, my issues basically three issues, regarding safety, the environment and the damage 16 17 that's going to be caused by this pipeline to our environment and the need. I don't see where the need for 18 this pipeline meets the standard that is required by the -19 20 - your regulations in order to get it's approval. 21 opinion, the pipeline is purely a company looking for 22 super profits and thus fails to take Branford and other town residents and businesses into consideration. 23 24 I really truly believe that your denial

85

HEARING RE: ALGONQUIN GAS/ISLANDER EAST AUGUST 5, 2003

1 would be in order. Again, I want to thank you for your 2. attention to this matter in town. 3 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. speaker, Gina R-I-V-E-Z-Z-I, okay? Followed by Timothy 4 5 Brockett. Ma'am? 6 MS. GINA RIVEZZI: Hi. My name is Gina 7 Rivezzi. I live at 77 Cedar Lake Road and own and operate a garden center at 1289 Foxon Road, Route 80, North 8 9 Branford and I'm directly impacted. The pipeline runs 10 directly through my property. 11 Since 1989 we have been effected in the 12 area by contamination that originated in the 1970's. Last 13 year's levels were in the 800's parts per million. Wells 14 had to be abandoned on Cedar Lake Road. My business 15 however is the most highly impacted. It's now 2003 and 16 the State is still trying to figure out how to get potable 17 water to the business. We cannot drink it. My concern is that if blasting were to 18 occur in order to penetrate the bedrock for pipe 19 20 installation migration of the PEC plume would occur 21 effecting the public water supply. It seems this issue 22 has been ignored to prevent answering questions that do 23 not have an outcome conducive to pipeline installation. 24 The State DEP has 14 years of information. The area where

1 the property is located is all rock ledge, it's across the 2. street from the Tilcon Quarry at our site. 3 Our family has been farming the area for over 100 years and we know the area like the back of our 4 5 hands. We still do not have potable water and PCE is a 6 known carcinogen. We've lived this nightmare for 14 7 The problem is not correctable, it's been proven. vears. 8 We're located in the public watershed area and the 9 contamination travels through the aquifers too sporadic to 10 even to determine. If this pipeline is allowed to 11 proceed, how many other will be without water? I know in 12 our case, 14 years is much, much too long. 13 I plead with the Corps to deny the Islander East's permit and protect the residents' water supply. 14 15 Thank you for your time. 16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you ma'am. The 17 next speaker, Timothy Brockett followed by Peter Brainerd. MR. TIMOTHY BROCKETT: Good evening. 18 name is Timothy Brockett and I'm a lifelong resident of 19 20 Branford. I come before you tonight speaking on behalf of 21 a rapidly growing group of people, who believe that the 22 Islander East Pipeline proposal holds many benefits for 23 the citizens of Branford and is an opportunity to help our 24 neighbors while strengthening our community. Our group,

1	BranfordPipeline.com, has studied the Islander East
2	proposal, walked the route of the pipeline in Branford,
3	met with Islander East officials and listened to the
4	pipeline critics. You may see what we learned by visiting
5	our web site at BranfordPipeline.com.
6	We are concerned about the effects the
7	Islander East Pipeline would have on the abundant natural
8	beauty of Branford and the kind, considerate and
9	thoughtful individuals and organizations that our town is
10	equally blessed with. We seek a solution that would
11	preserve and enhance the twin blessings of our community.
12	The proposed route through Branford would
13	require 30 property owners to grant a permanent easement
14	for the pipeline right of way to Islander East. At
15	BranfordPipeline.com, we believe that the proposed
16	pipeline offers an opportunity for the Branford Land Trust
17	to extend their holdings and fulfill the latter half of
18	their mission statement. Many of the property owners
19	effected will only lose the use of a narrow ribbon of land
20	that abuts the railroad right of way. With an Islander
21	East compensation check in hand and the possibility of a
22	tax deduction for a charitable contribution, the property
23	owners might be quite responsive to donating their
24	affected land and perhaps a little more, to the Branford

1	Land Trust.
2	The Branford Land Trust could promote our
3	community's appreciation of Branford's diverse natural
4	features by working with other civic groups and our
5	government to establish a four-mile long linear park and
6	nature trail. A linear park would enhance the natural
7	beauty of Branford and engage the kind, considerate and
8	thoughtful individuals and organizations our town is
9	equally blessed with.
10	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Thank
11	you. Our next speaker, Peter I believe it says, B-R-A-
12	I-N-E-R-O, is that correct?
13	MR. PETER BRAINERD: I'm Peter Brainerd, 15
14	Squaw Brook Road, Stony Creek. My family has been in
15	business in Stony Creek for the past 140 years and as
16	President of the Stony Creek Association I represent the
17	Executive Board of the Stony Creek Association and the
18	village of Stony Creek.
19	Stony Creek is vehemently opposed to any
20	proposal to place a pipeline under Long Island Sound.
21	This proposal is particularly objectionable because of the
22	highhanded manner in which it would devastate private
23	property and Land Trust open space despoiling fragile
	property and hand frube open brace despositing frugite

1	experiment with an untried diagonal bore under a major
2	boat channel through Stony Creek granite and then disturb
3	the bottom of the Sound across to Long Island. This
4	totally unneeded desecration of the waters off the Thimble
5	Islands will undoubtedly finish off the already tenuous
6	fishing, lobstering and shellfishing in this area.
7	Make no mistake, this project is driven by
8	corporate greed. This could be the ENRON of Long Island
9	Sound. There are alternatives that will do very little
10	damage to the environment. Islander East however, would
11	not make as much money by utilizing the existing Iroquois
12	Pipeline as they would by owning their own.
13	There's also considerable question whether
14	there is a vast supply of gas available as initially
15	thought. There is a question as to the actual demand and
16	need for this gas on Long Island. However, there is no
17	question that it would be bad for Connecticut, dreadful
18	for North Branford and Branford, totally unacceptable for
19	Pine Orchard and Stony Creek and a mortal blow to the
20	Thimble Islands and Long Island Sound.
21	Thank you for this opportunity.
22	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
23	speaker, David Carey, State of Connecticut, Director of
24	Bureau of Aqua-culture and Department of Agriculture.

1 MR. DAVID CAREY: It's Carey. Sorry. 2. came here tonight to speak on the marine construction 3 portion of the pipeline. However, listening to some of the comments here, if there is a need for the pipeline, if 4 5 that's determined, it has to go somewhere. And the Bureau 6 of Aqua-culture we prefer it not be in the Sound or at 7 least in areas where there's shellfish and of course, those in Branford and elsewhere know shellfish run almost 8 9 predominantly west to east. 10 So what poses a question that possibly 11 should be raised and looked at. The Iroquois line gives 12 us an opportunity 10 years after Iroquois in the marine 13 construction area there has not been success in the 14 restoration and mediation attempts. And the area isn't 15 available for commercial shellfishing. However, I believe 16 if you were to look inland on the majority of the wetland 17 crossing and restoration projects that were a part of the Iroquois project, if a statistical analysis was done you'd 18 probably see that 10 years later that those projects were 19 20 successful and that those wetlands may not be what they 21 were pre-construction, but don't have the impacts that we 22 see in the marine environment. And if that is true, and it is 23 24 statistically significant, that you can go through the

1	wetlands in a narrow area, develop this pipeline you
2	should be able to take a land route that crosses
3	significantly more wetlands and achieve less impact on the
4	Sound. And so I guess the charge would be that someone
5	look at the Iroquois project and determine if that is
6	correct. And if that is correct, the least environmental
7	impact route would be a land route that would cross more
8	wetlands, but that would be able to be restored within 10
9	years and would not have the impact on the marine
10	environment. Thank you.
11	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. Next
12	speaker Jared Cohane who will be followed by Barbara
13	Gordon.
14	MR. JARED COHANE: My name is Jared Cohane.
15	I'm an attorney from Eisenberg, Anderson, Michalik and
16	Lynch in New Britain, Connecticut representing Tilcon,
17	Inc. and the Branford Steam Railroad Company. I will
18	submit this for the record, but I'm going to briefly
19	summarize it for you.
20	"Tilcon, Inc. and the Branford Steam
21	Railroad Company are affiliated companies. They are the
22	owners and operators of a trap-rock quarry and a railroad
23	system extending from Tilcon's rock quarry in North
24	Branford southerly to Long Island Sound at Pine Orchard in

1 Branford. The Branford Steam Railroad system and its 2. rights of way were established to provide an economical and safe means of transporting Tilcon's stone to its Pine 3 Orchard Marine Terminal transshipping facility. 4 5 The proposed route of a new 24-inch high-6 pressure natural gas pipeline uses the Railroad's property 7 and right of way as a shortcut to Long Island Sound. The 8 proposed pipeline enters the Sound from Tilcon's property 9 at Juniper Point. The Applicant's plan is to bisect the 10 navigational channel leading to and from Tilcon's Pine 11 Orchard terminal with this pipeline. 12 My clients are concerned that the location 13 of the pipeline next to the active railroad and across the 14 channel will post significant operational problems for 15 Tilcon and the Railroad. The placement of a high-pressure 16 gas line adjacent to the busy Railroad and in the travel 17 way of the barges and boats is a significant safety 18 concern. Tilcon maintains a marine terminal basin 19 20 east of the loading facility where the barges are loaded 21 with trap-rock for transport by sea. This navigation 22 channel is approximation 80 feet wide and 1.5 miles long and extends out into the Sound. This channel is 23 24 maintained and dredged on a regular basis to allow its use

1 by our tugs and barges serving the Marine Terminal. 2. The dredging process requires -- the 3 dredging machine, a floating platform to sink three large spuds down into the bottom of the Sound to make a stable 4 5 work platform in the areas dredged. The Applicants are 6 aware of Tilcon's marine activities and the ongoing need 7 to dredge and maintain this basin and navigational 8 channel. Unless the pipeline is located in the bedrock, below the Sound's bottom, it would be subject to the 9 10 constant threat of rupture and damage from the ongoing 11 dredge and barge operations. 12 So if you determine that it is appropriate 13 that this project be permitted and this pipeline is to be 14 installed across Tilcon's marine basin or navigational channel, it can only be located in the bedrock as 15 16 represented by Islander East. The safety and welfare of 17 Tilcon and it's neighbors permits no other alternative. Any permit should contain a condition that requires the 18 installation of the pipeline 85 feet below the Sound's 19 20 bottom. Thank you. 21 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you sir. 22 speaker Barbara Gordon followed by Johan Varekamp. 23 MS. BARBARA GORDON: Good evening. My name 2.4 is Barbara Gordon. I live in West Hartford, a landlocked

1 community, so I can never be accused of being a NIMBY. 2. However, I'm thinking about moving down here. 3 I'm the Executive Director of the 4 Connecticut Seafood Council and I also serve as 5 coordinator of the Long Island Sound Action Coalition, 6 which is a group of concerned Connecticut citizens who 7 share a common goal, which is the protection of Long 8 Island Sound. The fifth annual report of the Bureau of 9 Labor Statistics of the State of Connecticut for the year ending November 30th, 1889 printed by order of the 10 11 Legislature stated that, quote, "The fisheries of Connecticut are old and important." End quote. 12 In 2003 the fisheries of Connecticut are a 13 14 little older, but no less important. In 1889, according to the report, the best fishing grounds included those in 15 16 Long Island Sound. In 2003 that importance has not 17 diminished. Long Island Sound still is home to a superior fishing industry. 18 19 Long Island Sound is a treasured source of both shellfish and fin fish. The Islander East Pipeline 20 21 is an affront to an industry which depends economically on clean waters in which to fish and it is an affront to 22 23 everything we hold dear environmentally. Plans for 24 Islander East are a blatant violation of the intent of the

1 public trust we have inherited from those who came before 2. It is now our turn to watch over that trust. 3 Long Island Sound must not become a victim of corporate greed, self-serving untruths and scare 4 The true fisherman does not want to be bought 5 tactics. 6 out or bought off. He or she is committed to the 7 continuation of a difficult, but honorable life upon the Sound providing not only a livelihood, but a wonderful 8 9 source of food and a future for generations of fishermen 10 to come. 11 Please help us preserve Long Island Sound 12 and our industry. Please deny the petition of Islander 13 East. Thank you very much. 14 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you ma'am. 15 Next speaker, Johan Varekamp followed by Larry Williams. 16 MR. JOHAN VAREKAMP: My name is Johan 17 Varekamp and I'm from Durham, Connecticut and I'm not standing in front of you to voice my personal opposition, 18 19 I'm standing here as a concerned scientist. professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Wesleyan 20 21 University and my expertise is in contaminants burdens of 22 Long Island Sound sediments and water quality issues in coastal salt marsh studies. I have read the Environmental 23 24 Impact Statement and I'd like to make four points.

1	This is in addition to the many
2	shortcomings that Arthur Rocque so excellently expressed
3	in his letter of the last week. The first one is in the
4	Environmental Impact Statement there's reference to
5	contaminant study by Mecray and Buchholtz and Brink that
6	was published in the Journal of Coastal Research. I was
7	the reviewer of the paper, I was the editor of the
8	Journal, I know his work extremely well. They refer to
9	the contaminants of the upper two centimeters of the Sound
10	sediment. The trench, as we all know, will be a lot
11	deeper and many of the deeper sediments are much more
12	contaminated than the surface sediments. So using the
13	surface sediment layer as a reference is questionable.
14	Second, the contaminants in the sediments
15	are associated with the fine-grained material in sediment.
16	Once we roll off the sediment, we dredge it, we dispose
17	it, it's a fine-grained material that will travel and be
18	deposited over a large area. This fine-grained material,
19	that's the stuff that carry the contaminants and has much
20	higher contaminant levels than the bulk sediments. Using
21	the bulk sediments are a reference, discretional at best.
22	A risk that is not discussed in detail in
23	the impact statement is the potential occurrence of
24	Harmful Algal Blooms during sediment disturbances. It's